



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,997	11/02/2001	Partha P. Tirumalai	SUN-P7005-RA	1272

22835 7590 06/29/2005

A. RICHARD PARK, REG. NO. 41241  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
2820 FIFTH STREET  
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

FOWLKES, ANDRE R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2192

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,997

Applicant(s)

TIRUMALAI ET AL.

Examiner

Andre R. Fowlkes

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the RCE amendment filed 4/4/05.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Santhanam.

As per claim 1, Santhanam discloses a **method for generating code to perform anticipatory prefetching for data references**, (col. 3:47-49, "The current invention provides a new compiler for such a processor that facilitates efficient insertion of explicit data prefetch instructions into loops within application programs"), **comprising:**

- **receiving code to be executed on a computer system; analyzing the code to identify data references to be prefetched**, (col. 3:50-51, "The compiler uses ... analysis (techniques) to determine data prefetching requirements"), **wherein analyzing the code involves:**

- **performing a first marking phase in which only data references located in blocks that are certain to execute are considered in determining which data references are covered by preceding data references** (col. 17:25-30, “a two-pass strategy is used... In the first pass, it is necessary to identify clusters of adjacent references... The distinguishing feature of each such cluster is that the references within the cluster share group spatial locality (i.e. data references that cover each other are determined)”, and col. 12:18-22, “(Only memory references (that are certain to execute are) ... analyzed for data prefetching purposes”),
- **performing a second marking phase in which data references that are located in blocks that are not certain to execute are considered** (col. 18:39-41, “Having identified the cluster leaders (i.e. the preceding references that cover other references), in the first pass, in the second pass, the algorithm attempts to exploit temporal locality between the clusters (i.e. references)”, and col. 14:6-7, “Now it is also necessary to address the issue of loops that have internal branches”),
- **inserting prefetch instructions into the code in advance of the identified data references** (col. 3:51-53, “Analysis and explicit data cache prefetch instruction insertion are performed by the compiler”), **wherein inserting prefetch instructions includes inserting multiple redundant prefetch instructions for a given data reference** (col. 6:61-62, “the system is issuing a redundant (prefetch) instruction(s) to the memory system to retrieve the same cache line (i.e. data reference)”)),

**- wherein inserting multiple redundant prefetch instructions involves inserting the multiple redundant prefetch instructions into unused instruction slots and wherein executing multiple redundant prefetch instructions potentially avoids a cache miss** (col. 6:56-67, "some of the prefetches are redundant ... Typically, computer systems that support this type of prefetch instruction track the instructions to determine if a requested address to prefetch a cache line matches a later prefetch to the same cache line. In such event, the second prefetch request to main memory is dropped (in other cases, multiple prefetch instructions are executed)").

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Santhanam discloses:

**- profiling execution of the code to produce profiling results** (col. 14:8-10, "using previously collected execution profile information, which indicates the execution count for each basic block"),

**- using the profiling results to determine whether a given block of instructions is executed frequently enough to perform the second marking phase on the given block of instructions** (col. 14:6-10, "Now, it is also necessary to address the issue of loops that have internal branches. The minimum loop iteration latency for such loops is estimated by using previously collected execution profile information, which indicates the execution count for each basic block in the loop body.").

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further, Santhanam discloses that **determining whether the given block of instructions is executed frequently enough to perform the second marking phase involves comparing a frequency of execution for the given block from the profiling results with a threshold value indicating a minimum frequency of execution to be considered in the second marking phase** (col. 12:18-22, "(Only) memory references with (a minimum stride value) ... are further analyzed for data prefetching purposes").

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Santhanam discloses that analyzing the code involves **identifying loop bodies within the code and identifying data references to be prefetched from within the loop bodies** (col. 8:30-35, "One important feature of the invention identifies loops and access patterns to allow a determination of how many cycles are devoted to loop iterations, and therefore allows insertion of the prefetch instruction(s)").

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further, Santhanam discloses that **if there exists a nested loop within the code**, (col. 16:60, "consider the following 'C' loop nest"), **analyzing the code involves:**

- **examining an innermost loop in the nested loop** (col. 17:5-6, "(the) inner j-loop (is examined)"),

- **examining a loop outside the innermost loop if the innermost loop is smaller than a minimum size or is executed fewer than a minimum number of**

**iterations** (col. 17:8-9, "It must be determined whether it is sufficient to insert only one prefetch instruction on behalf of (inner and outer loop references if the inner loop is executed fewer than a minimum number of iterations").

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated and further, Santhanam discloses that **analyzing the code to identify data references to be prefetched involves examining a pattern of data references over multiple loop iterations** (col. 14:7-10, "(Data references to be prefetched are identified) by using previously collected execution profile information, which indicates the execution count for each basic block in the loop body.").

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Santhanam discloses that **analyzing the code involves analyzing the code within a compiler** (col. 3:47-49, "The current invention provides a new compiler for such a processor that facilitates efficient insertion of explicit data prefetch instructions into loops within application programs").

As per claims 8-14, this is a computer readable medium/product version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims 1-7, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see Santhanam's new compiler (col. 3:47-49).

As per claims 15-21, this is an apparatus version of the claimed method discussed above, in claims 1-7, wherein all claimed limitations have also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see Santhanam Fig. 1 item 10, "computer architecture" and associated text.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicants arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive.

*In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:*

- 1) Santhanam does not teach executing redundant prefetch instructions for a given data reference, at p. 8:6-20.

*Examiner's response:*

- 1) In response to the applicant's argument that Santhanam teaches away from the instant application, the nature of the teaching is highly relevant and must be weighed in substance. A known or obvious composition does not become patentable simply because it has been described as somewhat inferior to some other product for the same use." See *In re Gurley*, 27 F.3d 551, 554, 31 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Although Santhanam discloses that it is not ideal to continuously execute multiple prefetch instructions, he also discloses that executing multiple prefetch instructions is sometimes necessary in order to potentially avoid a cache miss. Santhanam, col. 6:56-67, "some of the prefetches are redundant ... Typically, computer systems that support



this type of prefetch instruction track the instructions to determine if a requested address to prefetch a cache line matches a later prefetch to the same cache line. In such event, the second prefetch request to main memory is dropped (in other cases, multiple prefetch instructions are executed)".

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre R. Fowlkes whose telephone number is (571) 272-3697. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571)272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**TUAN DAM**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

ARF